

SECTION IV

The Working Group recommends a structural option for implementing a National Materials Program and four components for a National Materials Program.

**Adopt the Alliance Option
and Develop an Implementation Plan**

and

**Use Centers of Expertise
Seek Authority to Regulate NARM
Maintain an Information Infrastructure
Create a Standing Compatibility Committee**

Recommendations for a National Materials Program

The Working Group recommends the Alliance as a structure for a National Materials Program.

Adopt the Alliance Option and Develop an Implementation Plan

The Working Group recommends that the Commission adopt the Alliance Option as a sound basis for achieving its strategic goals, maintaining a national presence, and meeting the objectives of a National Materials Program as the NRC enters into more agreements with states. The Alliance Option is a flexible structure that permits "task organization" of national resources and expertise to quickly address any future health and safety issue.

An Implementation Plan should also be developed and used to ensure that the Commission's recommendations are fully enacted. Due to the significant changes involved in using the Alliance Option as the approach to a National Materials Program, the Commission will need to give the staff strong, clear direction for implementation. The Working Group recommends development of an Implementation Plan, regardless of the option the Commission chooses.

The Alliance as a National Materials Program

The Working Group recommends the Alliance Option based on numerous advantages, cost savings, and enhanced ability to share expertise.

Advantages and Justifications for the Alliance Option

- best suited for essential development of common goals and objectives, joint decision-making, shared resources and responsibilities
- greatest potential to achieve on a national level the goals in NRC's strategic plan
- highest rank in the analytical criteria used to evaluate the six options for a National Materials Program

Recommendation

The Working Group has determined through its evaluations that the Alliance Option provides the most assurances for meeting the needs of NRC, states, and a National Materials Program.

Strengths of the Alliance Option

The Alliance takes advantage of the many positive features found in the current program, which already enjoys a high level of familiarity and acceptance among regulators, licensees, stakeholders, and the public.

The Alliance Option leverages the collective experience and expertise of all stakeholders to accomplish the common goals, meet national priorities and schedules, and maintain an infrastructure essential to protect public health and safety.

The Alliance Option's flexible structure permits "task organization" of national resources and expertise to quickly address any future health and safety issue.

Rank Compared to Other Options

In order to assure it did not bias its recommendations, the Working Group also used a well proven analytical method, the relative value decision matrix, to evaluate the six options presented in Section III. The matrix helps ensure bias and subjectivity are minimized in the decision process; it is widely used in business and the military.

The results of the matrix analysis indicate that the Alliance Option is most consistent with the objectives of a National Materials Program. See Figure 4.1 on the following page. A description of the decision matrix and how it operates are found in Appendix D.

Relative Value Decision Matrix

The Working Group used the matrix to further analyze its recommendations.

The relative value decision matrix technique was used to mathematically analyze the options considered by the Working Group. This tool objectively analyzes the six options considered in Section III and reduces the subjectivity errors that occur when several options are simultaneously considered. The eight Evaluation Criteria are based on NRC's strategic goals, and the objectives of a National Materials Program previously identified by the Working Group.

Figure 4.1 - Evaluation of National Materials Program Options

Weight	4.68	2.06	1.04	1.04	1.04	1.04	1.00	1.04	Total
Evaluation Criteria	Maintains Safety	Optimize Resources	Promote Consensus	Account for Individual Program Needs	Flexibility	Exchange of Information	Harmonize Regulatory Approaches	Public Confidence	
Options									
Current Program (Base Case)	4	3	2	3	3	4	4	2	44
Minimum NRC Involvement	5	5	3	4	4	5.5	5	4	60
Independent States	6	6	5	1	1	5.5	6	5.5	65
Delegated Program	2	4	5	5	5	2	2	3	41
Alliance	2	1.5	1	2	2	3	2	1	24
Single Regulatory Agency	2	1.5	5	6	6	1	2	5.5	39

Relative Values Matrix (Less is Better)

Consistency Ratio = 99.28%

Costs Savings with the Alliance Option

The Working Group believes the Alliance Option will best use existing resources.

Two NRC factors greatly influence costs in the current materials program:

- **policy decisions**
- **degree or intensity of how policies are implemented**

Cost Savings

The Working Group believes that with the Alliance Option, some cost savings will be realized for both NRC and Agreement States because it creates an improved process for rulemaking, rule reviews, compatibility determinations, and developing common regulatory products. Actual savings depend on the level of participation in the development of regulatory products.

The Alliance Option spreads the responsibility for determining the direction and focus of a National Materials Program among a wider group of participants. This provides two advantages which should result in cost savings. The Alliance allows participants to:

1. affect policy decisions that direct the National Materials Program, and
2. control the degree or intensity of individual program participation.

The Alliance also offers the flexibility to use existing resources in a more focused manner. The Alliance Option offers the best opportunity for NRC to economically continue as a significant player in a National Materials Program as more and more states become Agreement States.

Assumptions Regarding the Alliance Option

The Working Group recommends the Alliance Option with the assumption that expertise and responsibilities will shift.

The Alliance Option is a necessary and practical solution to the issues NRC faces with the continued growth in the number of Agreement States and declining licensee base.

Assumptions Necessary for Success

1. States develop and maintain a level of technical and regulatory expertise at least equal to, or greater than, that of NRC.
2. The federal government transfers regulatory authority to states competent in developing and organizing programs that are adequate to protect workers and the public.

These assumption are in keeping with the trend that began in 1971 with the number of licensees regulated by Agreement States exceeding the number of NRC licensees. As states gain expertise and statutory authority, the federal agency transfers authority.

As more states become Agreement States, states will regulate even larger numbers of licensees. This will require states to develop and maintain more regulatory and technical expertise to meet emerging technologies. With fewer licensees and fewer types of uses of radioactive materials, it may become difficult for NRC to maintain an awareness of current and emerging technologies and to develop appropriate regulatory responses unless it significantly changes the way it interfaces with its stakeholders, the states, and the public. The experience base in many technical areas now lies outside NRC.

The Alliance Option offers the prospect of leveraging NRC's program by joining in a continuing collaborative process with other regulators. The process would jointly establish national priorities and agendas, share resources, and develop common regulatory products.

Recommendations for a National Materials Program

The Working Group recommends these components of a National Materials Program for Commission consideration.

The Working Group identified four components of a National Materials Program it believes the Commission should adopt. The Alliance is the structural option that most effectively incorporates these four components. However, the Working Group believes that these components should be adopted regardless of the option or combination of options the Commission chooses for the structure of the National Materials Program. Each of these components is discussed in greater detail in Section V.

Use Centers of Expertise

This concept optimizes resources of federal, state, professional, and industrial organizations and reduces duplicate efforts.

Seek Authority to Regulate NARM

Radioactive material is not regulated consistently on a national basis. The Working Group is aware that NRC is currently evaluating the issues involved with seeking authority to regulate NARM. In order to create consistency nationwide, the AEA would ideally authorize the regulation of NARM.

Maintain an Information Infrastructure

An information infrastructure would maximize the sharing of information and resources. Such a clearinghouse would consolidate resources, reduce duplication, promote Centers of Expertise, and provide alternative resources to stakeholders in a timely manner.

Create a Standing Compatibility Committee

The Standing Compatibility Committee would consist of individuals who would not be directly involved in the development of a rule. The compatibility recommendations to the Commission would then represent a broader range of input and would provide consistency in designating compatibility levels across the range of rules.